

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of certain informalities. Applicant have amended the specification to remove informalities.

Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 20 are objected to because of certain informalities. Claims 8 and 20 have been amended to remove informalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant have amended claim 14 to further clarify the recited subject matter. Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Claims 1, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ficarra. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 2, which has been indicated to be allowable. Applicant believes amended claim 1 is now allowable over Ficarra.

Claims 15 and 17 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficarra v. Yoshimi et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 8 and 14 depend from claim 1, which has been amended to distinguish from Ficarra. Accordingly, claims 8 and 14 now distinguish over Ficarra and thus, the combination of Ficarra and Yoshimi et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claims 8 and 14.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficarra v. Iwata. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, which has been amended to distinguish from Ficarra. Accordingly, claim 9 now distinguishes over Ficarra and thus, the combination of Ficarra and Iwata does not teach each and every limitation of claim 9.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficarra v. Schrader et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 12 depends from claim 1, which has been amended to distinguish from Ficarra. Accordingly, claim 12 now distinguishes over Ficarra and thus, the combination of Ficarra and Schrader et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claim 12.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ficarra v. Olkkonen et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 16 depends from claim 1, which has been amended to distinguish from Ficarra. Accordingly, claim 16 now distinguishes over Ficarra and thus, the combination of Ficarra and Olkkonen et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claim 16.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5137